CITY OF MIAMI BEACH TRANSPARANCY, RELIABILITY, AND ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE (TRAC)

## TRAC Meeting Minutes Thursday, June 5, 2008

CHAIR COMMISSIONER DEEDE Committee Members: Commissioner Deede Weithorn, Frank Del Vecchio, Sam Rabin, Steve Chaneles, Mike Burke, Robert Henry, David Lancz

VICE-CHAIR STEVE CHANELES

WEITHORN

City: Robert Parcher, Patricia Walker, Allison Williams, Anne Swanson, Robert Biles, Jim Sutter, Gladys Acosta

MEMBERS FRANK DEL VECCHIO MIKE BURKE SAM RABIN ROBERT HENRY Public: Sylvia Batista, Harry Cherry, Marty Evans

COMMISSION OFFICE ANNE SWANSON (305) 673-7105 Meeting was called to order at 5:18pm

In attendance:

STAFF LIASONS ROBERT PARCHER Frank Del Vecchio made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 22, 2008 meeting, Sam Rabin seconded the motion, approved by the committee.

PATRICIA WALKER

David Lancz introduced himself. He is a new member of the committee, replacing Larry Herrup, who resigned due to scheduling conflicts. Mr. Lancz is an attorney and also currently serves on the CMB Zoning Board of Adjustment and previously served on the Budget Advisory Committee.

CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE JEAN OLIN

Commissioner Weithorn introduced Jim Sutter, Internal Auditor for the City of Miami Beach, who presented an overview of the internal audit procedures the city practices. Each audit area's risk assessment is scored based upon an average rating of the following seven risk factors. For each factor a score is given a rating from one (low risk) to five (high risk).

1. <u>Dollar impact on Financial Statement Risk.</u>
Larger dollars (revenues and expenses) over \$1 million passing through an area (CIP Operations & Parking) receive a higher score of 5. Lower dollars (under \$50K) receive a score of 1 (Vending machines).

2. Public Exposure Risk

High visibility with intense interest from the public receives a score of 5 (Building) while a low visibility with no financial risk receives a score of 1 (Central services operations)

3. Fraud Potential

Where significant fraud potential exists a score of 5 (Parking meter collections). Low potential receives a score of 1 (Operations of various departments Mayor's Office, City Attorney, etc.

4. Complexity of Transactions

Very complex transactions (Procurement) receive a higher score of 5, while non-complex transactions (Central service inventory) receive a score of 1.

5. Quality of Internal Controls

Areas with no controls or major weakness noted score higher at a 5 (Property Management Inventory). Strong controls within an area are scored lower at a 1. (Cultural Arts Council).

6. Time Since last audit

More than 5 years since the last audit receives a 5 – (CIP Water & Sewer billings). Areas audited in the past year receive a 1 – (Public Works Inventory)

## 7. <u>Operational Changes</u>

Changes in operations and management: Completely new operations and systems and or recent changes in management (Account payable – CIP) receive a 5 score while operations with no changes significant changes (Convention Center & Fleet) score 1.

Discussion: The committee then took a look at a variety of other municipal websites (City of Coral Springs, Jacksonville, Orlando) to get an idea how other city's handle transparency in regards to building department issues, procurement, public records requests, complaint procedures, concurrency calculations.

Meeting Adjourned at 6:30pm Next Meeting to be held June 18, 2008 at 5pm in the Mayor's Conference Room